

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE



APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/878,806	06/11/2001	David A. Boeke	J&J-2025	3753
27777	7590 03/01/2005		EXAMINER	
PHILIP S. JOHNSON			MCCLELLAN, JAMES S	
JOHNSON & JOHNSON ONE JOHNSON & JOHNSON PLAZA			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
	WICK, NJ 08933-7003		3627	
			DATE MAILED: 03/01/200	5

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

^	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
	09/878,806	BOEKE, DAVID A.				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	James S McClellan	3627				
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the	correspondence address				
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM						
THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).						
Status		:				
1)⊠ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 21 Ja	nuary 2005.					
2a) ☐ This action is FINAL . 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.						
3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is						
closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.						
Disposition of Claims						
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>9-16 and 19-21</u> is/are pending in the application.						
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.						
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.						
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>9-16 and 19-21</u> is/are rejected.						
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.						
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.						
Application Papers						
9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.						
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.						
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).						
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).						
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	aminer. Note the attached Office	e Action or form PTO-152.				
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage 						
application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).						
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.						
Attachment(s)	_					
Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail D					
Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)	5) Notice of Informal I	Patent Application (PTO-152)				
Paper No(s)/Mail Date	6) 🔲 Other:					

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTOL-326 (Rev. 1-04) Application/Control Number: 09/878,806 Page 2

Art Unit: 3627

DETAILED ACTION

Request for Continued Examination

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 1/21/05 has been entered.

Amendment

2. Applicant's submittal of an amendment was entered on 1/21/05, wherein:

claims 9-16 and 19-21 are pending;

claims 18, 22, and 23 have been canceled; and

claims 9-11, 14-16, and 19-21 have been amended.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Art Unit: 3627

4. Claims 9-16 and 19-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over .

U.S. Patent No. 5,870,717 (hereinafter "Wiecha") in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,970,474 (hereinafter "LeRoy").

Regarding claim 9, Wiecha discloses a method for cooperative ordering of medical products over a network, comprising: providing a database (24) comprising information for purchasing a plurality of products; transmitting information for at least one product to a first client from said database of products (see column 3, lines 10-28), the transmitted information comprising an undiscounted price for the at least one product (inherent); receiving from said first client a request to order said at least one product (see column 3, lines 29-37); identifying the first client with a client set comprising multiple clients (18); storing said request to order said at least one product (see column 3, lines 29-37); and receiving from a second client an authorization to purchase said at least one product (see column 3, lines 29-37); [claim 10] the medical products comprise surgical procedure products; [claim 12] the network comprises the Internet (see column 7, lines 35-39); [claim 14] said product information comprises price information and wherein said price information is dependent on a customer account provided by one of said first and second client (see column 3, lines 13-16); and [claim 19] a computer-readable medium bearing instructions for carrying out the method of claim 9 (it is inherent that instructions to execute Wiecha's system are stored on a computer-readable medium).

Regarding **claim 20**, Wiecha discloses a system for cooperative ordering of medical products as described above in for method claim 1.

Regarding claims 9 and 20, Weicha fails to expressly disclose transmitting information to a third client indicative of the request for order by the first client, wherein the user at the third

Application/Control Number: 09/878,806

Art Unit: 3627

client may submit an order based on the order by the first client and may add a product to the third client's request. Additionally, Weicha fail to disclose the use of a volume discount buying model. Finally, Weicha fails to identify a medical procedure with the at least one product

LeRoy discloses a registry system for shoppers to purchase items selected by another user (see column 5, lines 41-51), wherein it is inherent that the shoppers to add additional items.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Weicha with registry shopping feature LeRoy, because a registry allows a second customer to purchase a product previously selected by a first customer, when the second customer is unsure what products to order.

Clark teaches the use of volume discounts (see Abstract) for the medical field (see column 9, lines 14-15).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Weicha with volume discounts taught by Clark, because cooperating for volume discounts reduces the costs for an organization.

DeBusk teaches the use of medical product ordering system that discloses an order comprising at least two products, wherein said two products are both used in a single medical operation (see column 7, lines 21-22) and identifying a medical procedure with that least one product (see column 9, lines 12-51).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Wiecha with the bundling of medical products used in the same medical procedure as taught by DeBusk, because ordering in bundles will help to ensure that all medical products for a specific medical procedure are ordered together and are available to the health

care professional at the time of the medical procedure. In contrast, ordering medical products individually would have a larger chance of the overall order containing an ordering error.

Regarding claim 13, Wiecha fails to expressly disclose transmitting information for a second product wherein said second product is a substitute for said first product.

DeBusk teaches the use of substituting products (see column 10, lines 18-23).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Wiecha with product substitution as taught by DeBusk, because providing a substitute product allows an order to filled when the originally selected product in unavailable and thus reduces the time to reorder.

5. Claim 12 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wiecha in view of LeRoy, Clark, and DeBusk as applied to claim 9 above, and further in view of Official Notice.

As alternative rejection, if it is held that Wiecha in combination with LeRoy, Clark, and DeBusk fail to inherently disclose communication over the Internet utilizing web pages, then the Examiner relies on Official Notice that it was old and well known at the time the invention was made communicate information over the Internet utilizing web pages.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Wiecha with Internet communication as was well known in the art, because utilizing the Internet allows global communication, wherein increasing the potential for suppliers to contact customers.

U.S. Patent Application No. US 2002/0065758 A1 (hereinafter "Henley") is relied upon as evidence of the use of Internet web pages as a form of global communication.

Response to Arguments

6. Applicant's arguments filed January, 21, 2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

All arguments are moot in view of the new grounds of rejection necessitated by Applicant's amendment.

Conclusion

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jim McClellan whose telephone number is (703) 305-0212. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 9:30 to 6:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Robert Olszewski, can be reached at (703) 308-5183.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-1113.

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patent and Trademarks Washington D.C. 20231

or faxed to:

(703) 872-9306 (Official communications) or (703) 746-3516 (Informal/Draft communications).

Hand delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park 5, 2451 Crystal Drive, Arlington, VA, 7th floor receptionist.

A.U. 3627